

EXHIBIT 10

July 9, 2014

Dan Guerrero
Director of Athletics
UCLA Department of Intercollegiate Athletics
JD Morgan Center
Los Angeles, CA 90095

Dan,

I wanted to follow up and provide you with a statement on the circumstances and my role surrounding the MS coding request. At the outset, I'd like to accept responsibility for my role in this situation. I am not seeking either a remedy or reduction of my punishment. I understand that as the Director of T&F/CC I am responsible for my teams as a whole, including conducting the athletics admission process per DIA departmental, University and Regents policies and procedures. In this regard I have failed. I want to assure you, that while I understand that it doesn't change the outcome or my responsibility, I did so out of ignorance, and not intention. I want to personally apologize to you for having brought negative attention to our department, and UCLA. I am thankful to be called a Bruin, and particularly grateful to continue to be one. Thank you for allowing me to continue to be a part of your team of coaches, and the program I so dearly love. I assure you that I will fully accept and address each of my mistakes, and use them as an opportunity to meet and exceed all of your expectations in the future.

Having said this, there are a few things that I must shed light on in this situation. I understand from our discussion last Wednesday that you expect complete and total candor from me in this, and all situations such as this. This statement is in that spirit, hoping that the DIA can become better through all of this in the end. Having fully read the report, as you had directed in our meeting, I will expand on the details of the MS Priority Coding request. From the report, and our conversation in the meeting, I understand that I have failed in two specific regards. The first being a failure to uphold the University Regents expressed expectation that 'financial and political factors should not affect admissions decisions', and the second being using a special admission to code a manager for our team.

I first became aware of MS when the Asst. AD for Development at that time, Josh Rebholz, stopped to talk with me as I walked to Ackerman from the JD Morgan Center for lunch. During the conversation Josh asked me if I had any room on my team for a female athlete, and if so would I assist with her admission. I asked who the athlete was, and what events she did. Josh indicated that he wasn't sure what events she did in track, but that she was the daughter of major donors DS and RS from Brentwood. I said that I wasn't aware of her; however I did have a few roster spots still remaining. I asked Josh "if it was important to the department to help get her in". Josh indicated to me once again that her parents were major donors to UCLA, and it was very important to development.

At that time I was completely unaware of the Regents prohibition on financial factors affecting all university admission decisions. I saw the request and my actions as being a team player for the DIA Development. While I am very active in development as a coach, I rely on those in Development for guidance and direction in all of my activities. I feel that rather than being the initiating influence in this coding request, DIA Development should have been the moderating and educating force. Would it be unreasonable for me to expect to receive accurate direction, and education from the department charged with the responsibility for that same activity? In my position the request from Development itself implied, albeit tacitly, that the activity was acceptable.

The next contact I had regarding MS, was shortly after the conversation with Josh, from Grant Chen. Grant initiated this meeting, and scheduled to meet with me through Leah Waller, my Director of Operations at the time. Grant came to my office to discuss helping MS. I asked why he, as a tennis coach, was concerned with this particular athlete. He explained that he was friends with the family, and if possible that he wanted to help with MS admission. He explained that there was no room for her in tennis, and she wanted to try to do track in college. I asked Grant what events she did. He said that she played tennis, and ran the 800m in track. I said that she could do Cross Country in the fall if she got in, but she would have to be a manager for the remainder of the year for indoor and outdoor seasons. I felt that this would satisfy the DIA coding request expectation that she compete in a season. I felt that if she remained as a manager following Cross Country, it would be a benefit to the team. It is not unusual for a SA to be on the cross roster, and not the other two, or vice versa. Grant agreed at the time that this would be acceptable. He also indicated that MS parents may make a donation, if she got in. At this point I assumed the donation offer to mean to the athletic department in light of my recent conversation with Josh. I think that it is very important to note that if Grant had asked me to do this, without the initial request coming from Josh; I would have disregarded the request completely. I had never had a request such as this from another sport coach.

Before I priority coded MS, I spoke informally with my sport supervisor about the request. I indicated my conversation with Josh, and his request for me to help her. I didn't discuss a possible donation, because at this time I still felt that it was a general donor potential situation, and not specific to the request (I.E. just helping out the department development outreach/ donor potential). My Sport Supervisor asked me if I had the roster space available, and what she did. I told him that I did have space for her, and she was an 800m runner. He asked if she was any good, and I responded that Grant said that she was pretty good. However, she was local and I didn't know her, so she probably wasn't great. I priority coded her with information I had received from Grant. While it is not common to take lower level walk-ons as part of the team, at times in the distance events these athletes develop later in their careers and become contributors.

Sometime following this was the first time that I heard a specific donation coming directly to T&F. This information, including the specific amount, on the donation came directly from Josh. He indicated that he had spoken with the parents of MS regarding the possibility of making a

100k, four year pledge. He asked if that amount would be impactful, I responded that it would be a huge help. At this point I understood there was to be a donation to T&F that had been arranged by Josh and Grant. I didn't yet understand the direct and intended timing of the gift. I am unaware of the relationship, if any, between Josh and Grant in setting this amount and terms of the intended gift.

My next mistake in the coding of MS was that I didn't verify the athletics information that Grant had given me on MS. While I would normally take this step (including in detail all performance standards with the Priority Coding request), in this case I trusted Grant's info. However, as I understood the info from Grant, I didn't falsify anything in my coding statement. Furthermore since the Priority Coding was from a member of our DIA administration (I.E. Asst. AD of Development), and I had spoken to my Sport Supervisor, I didn't feel that her performance level was really crucial to my coding statement. This was a failure on my part.

At the next Admissions Meeting MS was approved for admission to UCLA. Immediately Grant came to my office and thanked me for helping out MS, and her parents. At that time in the conversation he indicated that MS didn't feel comfortable doing Cross Country. In my opinion MS was not athletically up to the performance level to participate in indoor or outdoor T&F. At this time I felt that I had been manipulated into coding her under false pretenses (I.E. that she would do Cross Country and then following the season finish out the year as a manager). Shortly thereafter Josh informed me about a specific gift to T&F from the parents of MS. Now I felt trapped in the circumstances. MS had no intention of competing in Cross Country, and I understood that if I withdrew the admission following the donation it would have been a mess for Development and the DIA. In light of all of this, I felt that it would be best to just accept MS as a manager. I didn't see how anything else could suit the Development request, and save face. I understood that having a priority coded SA participate and kept for year one was a departmental expectation, although I didn't know that it rose to the level of a policy. This was also my mistake. At this point I should have walked up to the third floor and notified my Sport Supervisor that I was uncomfortable with the situation, and asked for his direction.

These are the circumstances surrounding my role in the priority coding of MS. I had wanted to share these when we had met on Wednesday, July 2nd. At that time I was unaware that the Bill Cormier report, and findings were final, and I believed that we were meeting to discuss the initial findings of the investigation. In fact I had thought that I would get an opportunity to revisit with Mr. Cormier, and I intended to fully share regarding Josh's role at that time. I had met with Mr. Cormier on Friday, May 23rd. Shortly thereafter I had shared the details regarding Josh's role in this situation with Matt Elliott in his Compliance office. I felt that since he was the only one privy to the Cormier investigation, I would confide in him. I had asked Matt to keep the details confidential, because my intention was to share these directly with Mr. Cormier. I understand that the push to quick judgment in this case was largely due to the pressure, timeline, and impending threat from AL's mother. This timeline limited my opportunity to fully disclose the fact of the MS coding.

I must admit that I am disappointed that in a rush to meet an exceedingly difficult and imposed timeline, I feel that I wasn't afforded the fundamental opportunity to state my case, rebut and address the investigative findings prior to being punished. Is it unreasonable to expect an opportunity to confront, rebut, and address the charges and findings that face you, prior to receiving punishment? In my opinion an important step was left out. However, that being said I will reiterate my position that I fully accept my role as described in this statement and the resulting punishment. Likewise, it only seems fair to expect that those with similar roles in this would be punished equally. That is for someone else to decide. I like Josh, and respect his ability and leadership in Development. As you know I probably work with Development more often than do most coaches. I have always found his direction to be insightful, and he has been critical in much of the success that I have enjoyed in my development outreaches. However, in this instance I feel that he played a definitive and negative role. The very branch within the DIA that should have completely understood the Regents charge against finances affecting admissions decisions initiated and was complicit in violating those same expectations.

Dan, I have brought the details of this forward, not to mitigate or lessen my role or responsibility, but in the spirit of candor and full disclosure as conveyed to me by both you and Petrina in our meeting. I hope and expect that there will not be any hard feelings, or retaliation, from Josh for my candor regarding his role in this. I also would ask for assistance that he and I can rebuild, renew, and continue a healthy and professional working relationship. I need a positive working relationship with Development to achieve my long term goals for these programs under my direction. Whatever the need may be, I am available to speak with you further if you desire. I promise continued candor, and assure you that I will treat this issue with discretion, and the highest level of confidentiality.

Sincerely,

Mike Maynard